

and goes to many foreign countries, the names of not more than three per cent of the democratic voters are to be found on its subscription books.

The Commoner can not possibly deal with state politics except as an issue raised in a state touches national questions? Even if The Commoner went into the home of every democratic voter, it could not possibly deal thoroughly with state issues since these differ in the various states and can not be fully understood by outsiders. There is an imperative demand, therefore, for a democratic state weekly. It does not require so much capital to start a weekly paper and it is even possible for one to carry on another business and yet write such editorials as may be necessary to present the democratic side of the state issues that arise from time to time. The Commoner calls for volunteers. Among the thousands of able and earnest democrats in each state it ought to be possible to secure one to undertake the establishment of a state paper, and such a paper ought to have a support sufficient to cover all expenses.

Nor must the work stop here. Every county needs a democratic paper. The cost of conducting a county weekly is still less, and the editorial work still lighter. The Commoner appeals to the democrats of the nation, especially to the democrats in the doubtful states, to give this subject earnest attention. Every democratic voter ought to take a democratic county paper, a democratic state paper and a democratic national paper. The subscription price of a weekly paper is usually \$1, and a clubbing rate could be formed between The Commoner and a democratic state paper and a democratic county paper by which the three could be furnished for \$2 or \$2.25. The newspaper is the least expensive form of literature. As part of the expense is paid by advertising, the reader really gets his paper for less than actual cost. There are very few democrats in the nation who could not afford to subscribe for three such papers and the three would give him information on all the political questions upon which he is called upon to act.

The democratic party can not hope to win except through educational work, and it can not do educational work unless the literature can be brought to the attention of the voters. The predatory interests are able to furnish newspapers for nothing because they make the money back out of the privileges which they secure from the government, but democratic papers must be self supporting, and they deserve the support of the masses so long as they protect the rights and guard the interests of the general public. The Commoner hopes to be able to notify its readers of the establishment of weekly democratic papers in the various states, and will also be glad to chronicle the establishment of county papers committed to the support of democratic principles and policies. Let the educational work begin, and begin at once.

STILL BLIND

The Atchison Globe, in a recent issue, contained the following: "Of course you remember when Mr. Bryan boosted for the free and unlimited coinage of free silver and made a good race on that issue. Very likely you were among those who boosted and voted for the same thing. But the idea did not take very well in this country, and is less popular today than it has ever been. And this rule seems to apply the world over."

The editor of the Globe is, on most subjects, an intelligent man. If he can be guilty of such misunderstanding of the subject, it is not strange that republicans who are less studious should be blind to the facts.

Now as to facts. During a period of more than twenty years the world—not the United States alone, but the world—had been disturbed by the appreciation of gold. This appreciation of gold—largely a law made appreciation—had brought a world wide fall in prices. Three international conferences had been called to discuss a remedy, and these conferences were attended by representatives of all the leading nations. Still the exploitation went on and the masses suffered while the owners of money and of fixed investments profited. John G. Carlisle pointed out the injustice; John Sherman admitted it, and James G. Blaine declaimed against it. It was a burning issue for years. The remedy proposed was the restoration of silver—that being regarded as the most practical means of increasing the volume of money. Sometimes the senate was for free coinage and sometimes the house. The house once passed a free coinage bill, Mr. McKinley, then a member, voting for it. In 1888 the republican party denounced Mr. Cleveland for discrimination against silver,

and elected its president; in 1892 both parties declared for bimetallism and Mr. Cleveland won. In 1893 Mr. Cleveland called a special session of congress and forced through the repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman law, being supported by a larger percentage of the republican senators and members than of the democrats. This made the issue acute and the question was taken up in the democratic party, and the democratic convention of 1896 declared for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the present ratio of sixteen to one, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation.

The republican party did not dare to advocate the gold standard; it only asked for the retention of the gold standard until the other nations would help restore bimetallism and pledged itself to work for an international agreement. The republicans won—it is not necessary to discuss the means employed or the fact that there was an enormous and still unexplained increase in the vote that year. The first thing that President McKinley did was to send a commission to Europe to get rid of the gold standard. England opposed doing anything, although less than a year before parliament had adopted a resolution looking to the restoration of bimetallism. Then, and not until then, the republican leaders openly declared the gold standard as fixed.

Since 1896 we have seen an increase in the production of gold unparalleled in history. This increase has not only checked the fall of prices and the appreciation of the dollar, but it has actually led to a world-wide rise in prices—a world-wide fall in the purchasing power of the dollar. These new discoveries of gold have brought the very thing that democrats were laboring for, namely, an increase in the volume of money. The increase has come from an unexpected source, but the increase has vindicated the democratic position, and yet even men like the editor of the Globe will write as if the democratic contention had been an unsound or foolish one. The democratic party was right; it took the side of the people against the privileges enjoyed by a few. But for the unexpected discoveries of gold the prosperity that we have enjoyed during the past decade would have been impossible. If the conditions of 1896 could be restored today; if one-third of the money of the country could be annihilated, we would return to the same kind of a business depression that we had then, except that it would be more acute because the change would be sudden.

Let no democrat be ashamed of the fight made in 1896. It was a fight that saved the democratic party from becoming the representative of the privileged classes.

IS THIS PROSPERITY?

The following from the New York Evening Post furnishes food for thought:

"This report of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor should be in the hands of every person, be he statesman or humble citizen, who recklessly urges large families in order to 'save the race.' This is what it has to say about the danger to the unskilled poor from the increase of the family:

"It is well known among social workers that the birth of a child is a serious menace to the prosperity of the ordinary day laborer's family, and that in the case of the unskilled poor in our great cities, the birth of a second or third child, even in prosperous times, often brings disaster to the home. Until the first children are old enough to work, the mother must either do profit-earning work at home, hire out, or go into the factory. If, through lack of proper attention, the baby falls sick or the mother's strength is wasted, the inevitable result is that from one to ten persons are thrown upon public or private charity for support. The mother becomes an invalid, her children are neglected and underfed, and make an early start upon the road to physical degeneration and pauperism."

"Yet the indiscriminating advocates of large families are also always the ones who exclaim about the physical degeneracy of the race! One case cited by the association is that of a family of eleven, the mother exhausted by the care of nine children and the father's ability to support the family long since outgrown. Had not the association stepped in, there would have been deaths from starvation with the total ruin of this family. The interests of the children the association watches over more and more, and with them, of course, the mothers. Instruction in caring for infants is now one of its most beneficent services, by means of the Caroline Rest teacher-nurses; this the association considers the surest way to prevent physical inefficiency and

the inevitable dependence. It has also done notable service in furthering co-operation of the various influences in the community which seek to prevent the waste of life."

The editor sees in it only a rebuke to the president for advising large families, but does it not really present an argument against the rearing of any children at all by the "ordinary day laborer?" The report, which the Post seemingly approves, says: "It is well known among social workers that the birth of a child (A child, not several) is a serious menace to the prosperity of the ordinary day laborer's family, and that in the case of the unskilled poor in our great cities, the birth of a second or third child, even in prosperous times, often brings disaster to the home."

The Post has nothing to say in condemnation of the conditions which make it impossible for an unskilled workman to raise a family of two or three children, even in prosperous times, and which make one child a menace to the ordinary day laborer's family.

Swollen fortunes on the one side—fortunes so large that they spoil the few children to whom they are left and, on the other side, poverty in the midst of prosperity! Are these the necessary fruits of civilization? Must prosperity cast these shadows or can these conditions be improved? Surely, the democratic party has still a work to do in a country where one child is a menace to the "ordinary day laborer" and where two or three children bring disaster to "the unskilled poor" "even in prosperous times."

COERCION OR BUSINESS

A republican paper quotes Vice President Brown of the New York Central railway as saying: "The morning after election I sent over one hundred telegrams releasing orders for railroad supplies and equipment for the New York Central lines alone, amounting to more than thirty-one million dollars. These orders had been placed contingent on the election of Mr. Taft." The republican paper then adds editorially: "This was not coercion. It was plain business." This is the same Mr. Brown who, according to the press reports, made speeches to the employes of the New York Central railway, threatening a wage reduction in case of a democratic victory and promising good times if the republicans won. By what course of reasoning can one reach the conclusion that Mr. Brown's conduct is legitimate and proper politics? If Mr. Brown has the placing of thirty-one million dollars' worth of orders and can place them with different firms "contingent" upon the election of his favorite candidate to the presidency, he might be in position to exert a deciding influence on the presidential election. He might pick out a number of firms in each of several doubtful states and place a contingent order with each firm. Counting the profit on each order at ten per cent, this would be virtually an offer of thousands of dollars to each firm to throw its influence to the republican ticket. If each firm employed a thousand men, the influence which Mr. Brown could thus exert might be a very perceptible one. A great many men who would look upon an offer of five, twenty-five or a hundred dollars for their political influence as a contemptible bribe might regard it proper to so use their political influence as to secure the profit of twenty-five, fifty or a hundred thousand dollars through a manufacturing plant, and it is easy to understand how a large order might coerce a considerable percentage of the employes when they were offered the promise of work on the one hand and threatened with idleness on the other.

If the New York Central can use thirty-one million dollars' worth of orders as a bribe, what about the Pennsylvania, the Erie, the Burlington, the Rock Island, the Santa Fe, the Northwestern, the Milwaukee, the Union Pacific, the Missouri Pacific, the Louisville and Nashville, the Southern, etc., etc.? If it is proper for one railroad magnate to thus use his influence in politics, where is the line to be drawn? And if all of these railroads go into politics, how is their vast influence to be overcome? And if the railroads can go into politics, why not the other big corporations?

If it becomes the practice of our great corporations to control elections by the placing of contingent orders, the people will find it very difficult to secure remedial legislation without first obtaining the consent of the corporations. Will any republican defend such a condition or point with pride to a victory won by the use of such means? Is this business or coercion?

All plans for the African hunt have been made, including the space rates.

305-FC73 v.9 1909